Notification No. D. Dis. Muz. C. 1703—35-36, *dated 7th April* 1936.

Under Rule 4 (7) of the rules issued under the Mysore Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation of 1927 the following gentlemen are appointed Dharmadarsis to supervise the affairs of Sri Vinayakadevaru temple at Handigodu, Tirthahalli Taluk, for a period of three years from the date of this notification.

Sl. No.	Name	Caste	Occupation	Remarks
	Messrs.—			
1	Ramiah ..	Brahmin ...	Landholder ..	Convener
2	Bagodu Subba Rao ...	Do ...	Do	
3	Kelur Jogannagowda ...	Namadari ...	Do	
4	Shanbhog Duggappiah ...	Brahmin ...	Shanbhog	
5	Patel Giriyappa ...	Namadari ...	Patel	

S. NARAYANA RAO,
Deputy Commissioner.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MYSORE AT BANGALORE.

Current No. 716 *of* 27-28, *dated the 7th April* 1936.

Subject.—

Amendment of Rule 98 of Order XXI of the first schedule of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1911.

The following amendment which the High Court proposes to make, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 122 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1911, to the said rule, is published, as required by the said section, for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby, and notice is hereby given that the said amendment will be taken up for consideration by the High Court on or after the 15th June 1936. Any objection or suggestion which may be received from any person with respect to the proposed amendment before the said date will be considered by the High Court.

Proposed Amendment.

Add the words "or on his behalf" after the words "at his instigation" at the two places occurring in Rule 98 of Order XXI of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1911.

The rule after amendment will read thus :—

"Where the Court is satisfied that the resistance or obstruction was occasioned without any just cause by the judgment-debtor or by some other person at his instigation *or on his behalf*, it shall direct that the applicant be put into possession of the property, and where the applicant is still resisted or obstructed in obtaining possession, the Court may also, at the instance of the applicant, order the judgment-debtor, or any person acting at his instigation *or on his behalf* to be detained in the civil prison for a term which may extend to thirty days."

Current No. 85 *of* 35-36, *dated the 7th April* 1936.

Subject—

Amendment of Rule 5 (1) of Order IX of the Code of Civil Procedure :—

The following amendment which the High Court proposes to make, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 122 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1911, to the said rule, is published, as required by the said section, for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby, and notice is hereby given that the said amendment will be taken up for consideration by the High Court on or after the 15th June 1936. Any objection or suggestion which may be received from any person with respect to the proposed amendment before the said date will be considered by the High Court.

Proposed amendment.

Substitute the following for the present Rule 5(1) of Order IX of the Code of Civil Procedure :—

5(1) Where, after a summons has been issued to the Defendant, or to one of several Defendants, and returned unserved, the Plaintiff fails, *for a period of three months from the date fixed in the summons for such Defendant to appear*, to apply for the issue of a fresh summons, the Court may make an order that the suit be dismissed as against such Defendant unless the Plaintiff has within the said period satisfied the Court that—

(*a*) he has failed after using his best endeavours to discover the residence of the Defendant who has not been served, or

(*b*) such Defendant is avoiding service of processes, or

(*c*) there is any other sufficient cause for extending the time, in which case the Court may extend the time for making such application for such period as it thinks fit.

A. SUNDARARAJA RAO,
Registrar.